

Remarks

Claim 1 is amended herein. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 remain pending in the Application.

Rejection under 102(b)

Claims 1-3 and 6-8

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bostrom et al. (5,856,632). Applicant has reviewed Bostrom et al. and respectfully states that Bostrom et al. do not anticipate the present invention for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully states that amended Claim 1 includes the feature “a filler panel body” and “a locating element coupled to said filler panel body.” Shown in the Figures and described in the specification.

Specifically, paragraph [0002] of the specification clearly states “Filler panels are conventionally used in conjunction with various computer chassis for electromagnetic interference (EMI) containment as well as for sealing of the computer chassis/card cage for thermal (e.g. forced airflow) cooling purposes. **Specifically, in a conventional computer chassis/card cage assembly, multiple slots are available to receive a corresponding printed circuit assembly (PCA). The filler panels are attached to the computer chassis to enclose or seal off regions/slots of the computer chassis which do not have a printed circuit assembly (PCA) disposed therein** (emphasis added). Typically, conventional filler panels are attached to the computer chassis using captive screws. The captive screws are disposed on the filler panels at locations corresponding to mounting holes residing within the computer chassis.”

Applicant also respectfully states that the Patent Claims are to be read in light of the Specification. Therefore, the filler panel body is not a nebulous concept which is to include car panels, wall panels, door panels, or the like, but is

in fact as read in light of the Specification an element covering the opening of the unused region/slot of a computer chassis.

Applicant respectfully disagrees that Bostrom et al. anticipates the feature of Claim 1. Applicant understands the card cage shielding contactor 40 of Bostrom et al. to not be analogous to the filler panel body of the present invention. Moreover, Applicant understands Bostrom et al. to teach (e.g., column 3 lines 4-15) where there are unused openings 22, **the unused openings 22 must be covered with a blank circuit card bracket** (emphasis added) in order to maintain the shielding integrity of the computer chassis 20 and avoid unwanted electromagnetic and radio frequency emissions. In addition, Applicant understands Bostrom to teach assuring intimate electrical contact between each **circuit card bracket 14 and the computer chassis 20, whether the bracket 14 is part of a circuit card 10 or is a blank** (emphasis added).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that it is not the card cage shielding contractor 40 of Bostrom et al. that is analogous to the filler panel body of the present invention as the Examiner has stated. Instead, it is the circuit card bracket 14 of Bostrom et al. that is analogous to the filler panel body of the present invention.

With the proper comparison of components, Applicant does not understand Bostrom et al. to anticipate a locating element coupled to the filler panel body. Therefore, Bostrom et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant also respectfully submits that Bostrom et al. does not anticipate the present claimed invention as recited in Claims 2-3 and 6-8 that are dependent on an allowable Independent Claim 1 and that Claims 2-3 and 6-8 recite further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claims 2-3 and 6-8 are allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Rejection under 103(a)

Claim 4

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 4 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bostrom et al. Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the present invention is not rendered obvious in view of Bostrom et al. for the following rationale.

With respect to Claim 4, Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 4 depends from the allowable Independent Claim 1 and recites further features of the present claimed invention. Therefore, Applicant respectfully states that Claim 4 is allowable as pending from an allowable base Claim.

Conclusion

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-4 and 6-8.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP

Date: 12/7/04



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060